PA 2117
.M75
Copy 1

writer's compliments.

[*For private distribution.*]

A FEW REMARKS

ON

THE PRONUNCIATION OF LATIN

BY

H. A. J. MUNRO

As the writer of these pages by no fault of his own, but by the accident of official position, has been called upon to assist in reforming the pronunciation of Latin, he would ask, nay earnestly beg, for criticism and advice from such of his readers as feel an interest in the subject.

205449
'13

PA2117
.M15

In discussing the pronunciation of a dead language it is well to remember 'the shrewd Sicilian's' Νᾶφε καὶ μέμνασ' ἀπιστεῖν. And I should probably have gone on to the end of my life in being sober and mistrustful in this matter, if it had not been forced on my attention from many different quarters which I could not disregard. Nearly two years ago Mr Cornish of Eton, in his own name and that of several of his colleagues, urged me to print something on the matter. For many reasons I declined at the time to enter on so slippery a course. Soon after some friends here, to whose judgment I could not but defer, among them Dr Lightfoot and our Public Orator, pressed me to try a reform. Thus stimulated I gave some lectures on the subject more than a year ago, and ever since have continued in lecturing to adhere to the system I then traced out. Last term Professor Palmer wrote to me that they were thinking of a reform at Oxford: at his request I sent a pretty full summary of the plan I pursued. This was received with very great courtesy by him and the distinguished Committee appointed to consider the matter. They were not however inclined to go so far as I had gone; and they have since circulated a private paper stating what course they were disposed to recommend. It is with reference especially to this paper that I print these remarks. Personally I should have been disposed to bow at once to such high authority; but I have been almost forced to move for the following reasons. On the one hand the Head-Master of Winchester wrote to me a month ago to inform me that 'at a conference of Schoolmasters held at Sherborne this Christmas...it was resolved to ask the Latin Professors of Oxford and Cambridge to issue a joint scheme of Latin pronunciation, to ensure uniformity in any changes contemplated'. On the other hand not only did I think myself, but I found it to be the general opinion of those whom I consulted, such as Dr Lightfoot, Mr John E. Mayor, Mr Jebb, Mr Cornish, that we might with advantage push reform farther than the Oxford paper proposes. Mr Mayor says 'I confess that I would rather keep to our existing pronunciation than accept any compromise'. Lastly that distinguished scholar and grammarian Mr H. J. Roby has published a paper, in which he declares himself in favour of a complete scheme of reform. It is with great diffidence therefore that I issue these remarks, for the sole purpose of allowing the questions involved to be considered and discussed.

I wish then to declare my full concurrence in the changes proposed in the Oxford paper and my reasons for going still farther. I hold that reform, whether partial or complete, should be undertaken for its own sake and the sake of the ancient language, not to make ourselves more intelligible to 'other Latin-reading nations', who are not intelligible to each other without special cultivation. A Frenchman's Latin is at first as unintelligible to an Italian, as ours is, and more absurd; a Spaniard cannot be understood by Frenchman or Italian; a Scotchman's brogue, while retaining something of the proper vowel sounds, has most of our own disagreeable peculiarities, is unpleasing and but partially intelligible to us, and cannot be understood by Spaniard, Frenchman or Italian[1].

Are we then (and this is a vital question) to endeavour to observe quantity systematically, to distinguish between long and short, and longer and shorter, syllables? If this is to be done, we must break alike with all existing pronunciations, Italian as well as English. The tyranny of the accent over quantity is perhaps more marked in the Italian than in our own reading of Latin. We learn from Cicero and Quintilian that rhythm or a due admixture of long and short syllables was important in prose as well as verse; and for myself, by observing quantity, I seem to feel more keenly the beauty of Cicero's style and Livy's, as well as Virgil's and Horace's. The same I find to be the case with those in whose judgment and knowledge I confide. Mr Mayor writes to me: 'As regards quantity, C. of Shrewsbury, a most experienced and intelligent teacher of elementary classics, tells me that since he has made his boys distinguish *căno*, *cănis* and *cānus*, *lĕgo*, *lĕgis* and *lēx*, *lēgis*, and sound all long syllables long, and short short, in whatever positions, he finds them perfect in quantity for verse composition'.

Though we break however with all existing systems, Italian appears to me to offer many valuable aids which it would be most unwise to neglect. English seems so utterly different in all its tones, its entire vocalisation, from old Latin, that often we cannot find in it even single sounds to give as the representative of a Latin sound. The Italian of literature has been fixed for six centuries; the more we examine the two, the more we feel that the Romano-Tuscan of to-day is essentially the Latin of the 7th or 8th century; that 'Siede la terra dove nata fui' must represent very nearly the 7th century pronunciation of 'sedet (il)laterra deúbi nata fui'; that race and climate and much else have made the 'lingua Toscana in bocca Romana' to inherit in a higher degree than any other language the refinements of old Latin. Let me not be misunderstood: I feel

[1] I have a sufficient knowledge of the ordinary Scotch method and care for no contradiction however flat. If in Edinburgh or elsewhere any pursue a superfine system, acceptable alike to gods and men, to Spaniard, Italian and ancient Roman, that is not Scotch, but some ideal which common mortals would fain attain to, but cannot.

most strongly the truth of Dr Ridding's judicious words, when he writes: 'the point which would be likely to cause the greatest difficulties, would be very subtle distinctions of shades of vowel sounds. But if any such were proposed, we should have to let boys be rough in it, and they would be rough in it. I feel there is so much to be said in favour of doing a thing as thoroughly as possible, that I would say no more than just this, that a subtle foreign pronunciation will not be realized at school I think'. What I mean is this: our English sounds are so different from what we must suppose the old Latin to have been, that, by looking only to them, we should probably fall into such slipshod ways as to make our new pronunciation hardly better, perhaps more distasteful than our present. I do not propose that every one should learn Italian in order to learn Latin. What I would suggest is that those who know Italian, should make use of their knowledge and should in many points take Italian sounds for the model to be followed; that those who do not know it, should try to learn from others the sounds required, or such an approximation to them as may be possible in each case.

In seeking to recover in some degree the old pronunciation, we have many great advantages in Latin, compared with Greek: 1. from the literature developing itself comparatively late, and so not stereotyping the orthography: we see in the first volume of the Corpus inscr. Latin. a map as it were of the language spread open before us, and feel sure that change of spelling meant systematical change of pronunciation: *coira, coera, cura*; *aiquos, aequos, aecus*; *queiquomque, quicumque*, etc. etc.: 2. from the far less complexity of sounds, diphthongs mostly disappearing and the two chief ones left, *ae* and *au*, being easy to pronounce: 3. from the invaluable service the Italians have rendered us in keeping the accent in most cases on the right syllable, even while changing its nature. Many of us I fear are quite unconscious of the debt we owe them; but, had we been left to our own lights, the confusion in Latin might have been as disastrous as in Greek. In observing quantity we shall still keep the accent in its proper place, but its tyrannical predominance will be abated.

At first the Latins seem to have been careless enough in matters of grammar and pronunciation. From the time of Ennius onwards this nation of grammarians devoted so much pains and attention to these matters that by the time of Cicero and Virgil the language had attained a perfection as great as that of Attic in its palmiest days. The slurring over of final syllables, once its great weakness, had been so much corrected by careful culture that, if Virgil's antiquarian prejudices had not stood in the way, we may infer from the example of Ovid, that elision of long syllables and many short ones would have almost disappeared. Every change in pronunciation seems to have been carefully marked by a change in the spelling. We may thus I think approximate to the true pronunciation. This approxi-

mation, it may be said, will after all be a rude one. Very well: that may be an argument for doing nothing at all; but not I think, if we try a reform, for doing it imperfectly. With this preface I will proceed to shew where it seems to me we might safely go beyond the Oxford circular in correcting our pronunciation of the different letters: after that I will say a few words about quantity, accent and elision.

'*ā* should have the sound of *a* in *father*: *ă* that of the first *a* in *papa*'. As the first *a* of *papa* would seem in English mouths to be sometimes a short *a*, sometimes a short *i*, sometimes a short *u*, and as it is well to accustom the English to open the mouth and expand the chest, I would add: or still better, *ā* should have the sound of the accentuated, *ă* of the unaccentuated Italian *a*: *amáta, pádre, padróne*. Of course *ă* and every short vowel should be pronounced short, when the syllable in which they occur is only lengthened by position.

'*ē* (and *ae*) should have the sound of *a* in *cake*: *ĕ* of the first *a* in *aerial*.' The first *a* of *aerial* has to my ear a very vague sound: I would add: or better, let *ē* have the sound of the Italian closed *e* (*é*): *ĕ*, whether the syllable is short or lengthened by position, and *ae* that of the Italian open *e* (*è*): *aréna, ridé*, but *bènè, tèmèrè*: *ést* ('eats'), but *èst* ('is'); *léctus* (partic.), but *lèctus* ('bed'): *Caèsar, musaè, Aèaèaè*. Thus in Italian as a rule *é* represents the long, *è* represents the short Latin *e*; while Latin *ae* is *invariably* represented by *è*: *Cèsare, sècolo*, etc. Diez compares the German *lehen, wegen* for the open, *legen, heben* for the close *e*. In English perhaps *pear* will give a notion of open, *pain* of close *e*. In Italian they do not distinguish between naturally long and short vowels, when the syllables are long by position; but we should do so in Latin I think: *méns, mèntis*. In Italian too the open and close sounds are only perceived in the accentuated syllables.

In Lucilius' time the rustics said *Cecilius pretor* for *Caecilius praetor*: in two Samothracian inscriptions older than B.C. 100 (the sound of *αι* by that time verging to an open *ϵ*), we find *muste piei* and *muste*: in similar inscriptions *μύσται piei*, and *mystae*: *Paeligni* is reproduced in Strabo by Πελιγνοί: Cicero, Virgil, Festus and Servius all alike give *caestus* for *κεστός*: by the first century, perhaps sooner, *e* was very frequently put for *ae* in words like *taeter*: we often find *teter, erumna, mestus, presto* and the like: soon inscriptions and Mss. began pertinaciously to offer *ae* for *ĕ*: *praetium, praeces, quaerella, aegestas* and the like, the *ae* clearly representing a short and very open *e*: sometimes it stands for a long *e*, as often in *plaenus*, the liquid before and after making perhaps the *e* more open (*σκηνή* is always *scaena*): and it is from this form *plaenus* that in Italian, contrary to the usual law of long Latin *e*, we have *pièno* with open *e*. With such a pedigree then, and with the genuine

Latin *ae always* represented in Italian by open *e*, can we hesitate to pronounce the *ae* with this open *e* sound?

'*ī* should have the sound of *e* in *he*, *ĭ* of *e* in *behalf*': I should prefer: *ī* shall have the sound of the accentuated, *ĭ* of the unaccentuated Italian *i*: *tímidi.*

'*ō* and *ŏ* should be sounded as at present': in this I cannot acquiesce: what is the present *ō*? *non, bos, pons, honos*? or, *nos, hos, domos*? these *o*'s we English utter with totally different sounds: we have scarcely in English or in English-Latin a genuine *o*, except perhaps before *r*: *roar, mores*: then what is our Anglo-Latin *ŏ*? how does it differ in *dŏmum* and *dōnum*? Here too the close and open Italian *o* represent respectively the long and short Latin *o*, on the exact analogy of *e*. Let us then represent *ō* by the close, *ŏ* by the open Italian *o*: the name of the painter Benózzo Gòzzoli gives a specimen of the two *o*'s. Or I care not if we take the long and short German *o*: *ōhne, gŏld*: for our purpose. Here too *au* has a curious analogy with *ae*: the Latin *au* becomes in Italian open *o*: *òro, òde*: I would pronounce thus in Latin: *plòstrum, Clòdius, còrus.* Perhaps too the fact that *gloria, vittoria* and the common termination *-orio* have in Italian the open *o*, might shew that the corresponding *ō* in Latin was open by coming between two liquids: compare *plenus* above.

'*ū* should have the sound of *o* in *who*, *ŭ* of *u* in *fruition*': or, of accentuated and unaccentuated Italian *u* respectively: *túmulo, tumúlto.* For that large class of words, comprising all superlatives and many other kinds of nouns and of verbs, Quintilian (I, 4, 8) gives a valuable hint: 'there is a middle sound between *u* and *i*; for we do not pronounce *optimum* (*optumum*) either as *optimum*, or as *optumum.*'

'*au* should have the sound of *ow* in *owl*'; I should prefer the Italian *au* which gives more of the *u*, than our *owl, cow.*

'*eu* should be sounded as at present': for Greek words, adopted into Latin, let Greek authorities tell us what is right: of Latin words there are but two or three, *heu, ceu, seu*: I prefer the Italian *eu* which gives you more of the *e*, than the English *you* sound of these words does: '*ui* as *we* in *we*': here too in Latin we have but two or three small words, *cui, hui, phui.*

'*oe* should have the sound of *a* in *cake*': here too (putting Greek words out of the question), when hateful barbarisms like *coelum, coena, moestus* are eliminated, *oe* occurs very rarely in Latin: *coepi, poena, moenia,* besides the archaisms *coera, moerus* and the like, where *oe,* coming from *oi*, passed into *u*. If we must have a simple sound, I should take the open *e* sound which I have given to *ae*: but I should prefer a sound like the German *ö*. Their rarity however makes the sound of *oe, eu, ui* of less importance.

'*ei* should have the sound of *i* in *idle*': surely this cannot be right. But this too is a diphthong which has practically disappeared from Latin, owing to the people's dislike to complex sounds: we find *hei*

(more correctly *ei*): *ei* (dat.) and *rei* are sometimes monosyllables, and Horace has *Pompei, Voltei,* Virgil *Penei.* But in the older language there are thousands of *ei*'s, later *i* or *e*: surely we are not to pronounce all these with the English *i* sound, in defiance alike of euphony and consistency. I should infinitely prefer either the Latin and Italian long *e,* or long *i*; i.e. to pronounce *omneis* either as *omnes* or *omnis.* But as the diphthong is important, I would much rather give it the Italian or Latin *e* sound quickly followed by an Italian or Latin *i* sound. Then there is an important class of words of which the Oxford paper takes no note: are we to give the English *i* sound to such forms as *eius, Pompeius, Seianus*? And here I will take together a large class of similar words in *ai, ei, oi, ui,* which have really two *i*'s, a vowel and a consonant, and which in old times were often so written, as we see in inscriptions and good Mss.: Quintilian tells us that Cicero preferred '*aiio Maiiam*que geminata *i* scribere'; and we know from Priscian that Cæsar in his de analogia spelt *Pompeiii* (gen.) with three *i*'s, and explained how they were all to be pronounced. We English shew in these words our usual undaunted inconsistency: we say *Maia* but *major, Graius* but *Troja, ejus* but *Pompeius*; *Seius,* while we call his son *Sejanus.* In such words the *i* has a double force, that of the vowel together with that of the consonant *i* (our *y*): the Greeks always write Πομπήιος, not Πομπειος. In all these cases I conclude we should give the long Latin or Italian *a, e, i* sound respectively, followed by an English *y* or Italian *j* sound: *Grā-yus, Mā-ya, mā-yor, Trō-ya* (this word has the open *o* sound in Italian), *ē-yus, Pompē-yus, Sē-yanus, cū-yus.* So with the compounds of *iacio*: *ē-yicit, āb-yicit, rē-yicit*; though we should always write them with a single *i*: *eicit* etc.: *Gāĭŭs* is a dactyl, *Caius* a nonentity. The *o* or *e* of *proin, proinde, prout, dein, deinde,* when not forming a distinct syllable, is elided, does not form a diphthong, and must be treated as cases of elision between two words: in *neutiquam e* is elided as much as in *numquam, nullus*: the Greek *eu* and *yi* I refuse to pronounce upon.

We come now to consonants: the Oxford paper proposes that the consonant *i,* or *j,* should have the sound of *y* in *yard*: that consonant *u,* or *v,* should be sounded as at present. That we should sound consonant *i* as our *y* I am quite agreed: equally persuaded am I that we should give consonant *u* the nearest sound possible to the vowel *u,* the sound that is of our English *w.* This I hold to be called for by the whole inner structure of the language: comp. *iuvenis, iunior*; *noverat, norat*; *motus, momen, nuntius, nundinae,* etc. etc.: by the fact that the Greeks employed their *ου* to form words which must have been utterly barbarous to their ears, in order to reproduce precisely the Roman sounds: Οὐαληνς, ἀδουεντος, and many others even more repulsive: lastly by clear external evidence. Gellius is fond of quoting Cicero's friend Nigidius Figulus, next to Varro the most learned of the Romans. Now the passage about the vowels cited by Gellius

at the end of his 19th book seems to me to shew that the consonant *u* in *Valerius*, etc. had the same relation to the vowel, as the *i* of *iecur*, etc. had to the vowel *i*; and that in both cases they were as near to the vowel sound as they could well be. Still more convincing is the curious passage in x 4: unless *vos* was sounded *wōs*, the story would seem to have no point or meaning. Now Gellius quoting Figulus covers the whole classical period. Why should we then renounce the advantage we have over others in our *w*, surely a nobler sound, to us at least, than *v*?

The circular shrinks from giving *c* and *g* uniformly the sound of *k* and hard *g*; and leaves *ci* and *ti* (and ? *si*) before another vowel to be sounded as at present. As for special reasons I have spoken of these points so fully in an Appendix, I will only say that, since *ken*, *kin*, *get*, *give* are such genuine English sounds, I see no reason for not allowing them in Latin, and many reasons for the contrary; and that our *rashios*, *fashiams* and the like are hardly compatible with a reformed system.

The circular does not touch on other consonants: I wish to make a few remarks on some of them: *bs*, *bt* should always be sounded, generally written, *ps*, *pt*: *lapsus*, *aps*, *apsens*, *apstulit*, *Araps*, *urps*, *opscenus*, *optulit*, *supter*: and generally assimilation should take place in pronunciation, if not in spelling; *acc-*, not *adc-*, *imm-*, *imp-*, *coll-* etc.

d and *t* we treat with our usual slovenliness, and force them up to the roof of our mouth: we should make them real dentals, as no doubt the Romans made them, and then we see how readily *ad at*, *apud aput*, *illud illut* and the like interchange: *f* seems from what Quintilian says to have been sounded with a stronger breath than we employ; but I suggest no change: *m* before *q* had a nasal sound: *quamquam*, *numquam*: final *m* was sounded slightly and indistinctly, as is proved by its elision and the testimony of grammarians: *quu* I avoid, pronouncing *cu* or *quo*: *cum* or *quom*, *ecus* or *equos*: *r* we should sound more strongly and distinctly than we do at present.

Of *s* I would say a few words, as it has many interesting analogies in Italian: *s* between two vowels has in Italian and French a soft *z* sound like our *rose*: I would thus sound it between two vowels in Latin: *rosa*, *musa*, *miser*. But words of this kind in Latin are comparatively very few, and in Italian there are most suggestive exceptions to *s* being soft between two vowels: in *cosa*, *riso*, etc. and in the adjective termination *-oso* it is sounded as our *s* in *sad*: these words represent *causa* (*caussa*), *risus* (*rissus*), examples of that very large class of which Quintilian (I 7, 20) speaks: he tells us that Cicero and Virgil wrote *cassus*, *caussae*, *divissiones*. There are vast numbers of such words, in which *ss* was the original spelling, a lost consonant having been assimilated, and the vowel was always long. The old Latin pronunciation seems to have been to dwell on the long vowel or diphthong, and sound the *ss* as a single sharp *s*, as in the

Italian words quoted: *cau-ssa, cā-ssus, mī-sit* (*mi-ssit*), *mī-ssus, iū-ssus, rū-sum* (*ru-ssum*) for *rūrsum, odīo-sus* (*-ssus*) etc. etc.: the *ss* and *s* seem to have been sounded alike. At the beginning and end of words too, and at the beginning of syllables, and before consonants, *s* is always sharp in Italian, and should be so in Latin: *sol, stella, de-sero, ni-si, qua-si, bos, nos, sonus.*

There are 5 letters or unions of letters wholly alien to the old language and brought into it for the sole purpose of reproducing precisely Greek sounds: *y, z, ch, ph, th*: we have abundant evidence that *y*, or Greek *υ*, had some sound between *i* and *u*, probably like either French *u* or German *ü*; and one of these sounds I should wish to give it. Of *z* I do not feel competent to speak. The modern Greeks sound *θ, φ* as we do, *χ* like a strong Scotch guttural: in old Greek and Latin it seems to be generally agreed that the tenues *c, p, t* were distinctly sounded and an *h* sound appended. I should not venture to suggest such a pronunciation for Latin *ph* and *th*; but should prefer it for *ch*, as this would not be a difficult sound, and the Scotch or German guttural is strange to the English tongue.

gn was sounded as we sound it, not as the Italians and French pronounce it. Though I do not propose to change the sound of *n* before *c* and *g*: *anceps, ango* and the like; it seems to have been nasal, nearer a *g* sound, and many grammarians wished to write *agceps, aggo, aggulus*, as the Greeks actually did for similar reasons: ἄγγελος, ἐγκρατής; though oddly enough both Italians and modern Greeks have here a clear *n* sound.

In modern Latin pronunciation quantity is systematically neglected: attention to it seems to me essential in any reformed method, attention too to the natural length of vowels when long by position. In Latin there is no *η* and *ω*, Lucilius unluckily for us having laughed out of fashion the poet Accius' invention for noting naturally long syllables by doubling them, though we find many traces of this in the older inscriptions: *Maarcus, paastores*: so *ee* for *ē*, *I* for *ī*, as *vIximus* as well as *vIvo*: *ou* for *ū* as *poublicom.* Apices were often used afterwards in all ages to mark naturally long syllables: *Mártis, fécerit*: both these usages are noted by Quintilian. We know too that the vowel of the supine and cognate parts of the verb was always long by nature, if the vowel of the present indic. though short was followed by a medial: *aactus, leectus* (partic.), but *factus, lectus* (subst.): Cicero (Orator § 159) tells us also that *every* vowel when followed by *ns* or *nf* became long by nature: *Insanus, Infelix,* but *indoctus*: *coonsuevit, coonfecit,* but *composuit.* And this is borne out by abundant other evidence: we find in Greek Κλήμης Κλήμεντος, Οὐάλης Οὐάλεντος and the like. Priscian too (II 63) tells us that *gn* made the preceding vowel long by nature: *reegnum, staagnum, benIgnus, malIgnus, abieegnus, privIgnus*: and this is confirmed by our finding in inscriptions more than once the apex of a naturally long vowel attached to *regni, regno,* and also *sIgna, dIgni,* and in

Greek the form Ῥῆγνοι: we must not be misled by the wrong accents Μάρκος for Μᾶρκος, Μάγνος for Μᾶγνος, there being conclusive testimony for the length of the vowel. The rhythm of prose as well as verse will be improved, if we attend to such points: *amaans amaantis, doceens doceentis, legeens audieens,* but *legentis audientis*; *amaandus, doceendus,* but *legendus, audiendus*: *Moonstrum horreendum Informe ingeens*: *Insontem Infaandoo indicioo,* and the like. An extruded consonant too often leaves a naturally short vowel long: *ex, ee*; *sex, seescenti, seemis*; *Sextius, Seestius* (σηστιωδέστερον nihil novi); *ees, eest* from *edo*. By comparing Cicero (de orat. III § 183) with Quintilian (I, 5, 18) we learn that in the time of the former the prose pronunciation was *illĭus, unĭus,* etc.: in the time of the latter *illīus, unīus,* he and subsequent grammarians holding the lengthening to be a poetical licence.

Plautus and Terence, following the usage of common life, never lengthen a short vowel before a mute and liquid: compare on this point Aristophanes with Euripides, Euripides with Homer: and in prose we should always keep such syllables short. When in the learned verse such syllables are lengthened, we should still sound the vowel short, and lengthen the syllable by separating distinctly the two consonants: *Gnatum ante ora pătris, păt-rem*: *Et Lycum nĭg-ris oculis nĭgroque*: *similis volŭcri, nunc vera volŭc-ris.*

The Italians, as I have already observed, have done us an incalculable service by keeping in most cases the accent on the right syllable, though the loss of quantity has changed its nature. It would be well to recal the accent to the right place in the cases where we now neglect to do so; to draw it forward towards enclitics: *armáque, omniáve* as well as *armîsque*; *tantáne*; to pronounce *tantôn, posthâc, postéa, praeteréa, adéo* (adv.), *quiprîmus abóris, intersê, apudmêst,* etc.

In respect of elision I would only say that, by comparing Plautus with Ovid, we may see how much the elaborate cultivation of the language had tended to a more distinct sounding of final syllables; and that but for Virgil's powerful influence the elision of long vowels would have almost ceased. Clearly we must not altogether pass over the elided vowel or syll. in *m*, except perhaps in the case of *ĕ* in common words, *que, neque* and the like.

In conclusion I would repeat that, if we are to reform our pronunciation at all, it would be well to do it as thoroughly as we can, and get rid of as many of our Shibboleths as possible; and would suggest that exact uniformity does not exist among us now, and need not be looked upon as indispensable in a reformed system. At all events 'liberavi animam meam'.

TRINITY COLLEGE: *February* 1871.

APPENDIX.

An article which has just appeared in the Academy of Feb. 15 by Mr Max Müller, 'on the pronunciation of *c* before *e*, *i*, *y*, *ae*, *eu*, *oe*', and is argued out with his usual power, will help no doubt to make innovation more difficult here. His chief objection to change would seem to be the same as that urged in the Oxford circular, that it could not 'be attempted without intolerable offence to the ears of all the Latin-reading nations'. He speaks of 'fear of ridicule', 'a dislike of the harsh and disagreeable sound of such words as *Kikero*, *fakit*'. This difficulty has never struck me as of such very great weight; and my ear has already accustomed itself to look on *Kikero*, *skelus*, *skio* and the like as even more euphonious than their former sounds. Of course I assume that *Sisero*, *Sesar*, *Sephalus*, *sinic* and the like are still to be English for the new *Kikero*, *Kaesar*, *kynicus*, just as much as for Κικέρων, Καῖσαρ, Κέφαλος, κυνικός. Our present English pronunciation of Latin appears to afford some arguments to the point. Some centuries ago we pronounced with the rest of Europe (I assume now the new and corrected sound of the vowels) *cana*, *cara* and the like, as *kana*, *kara:* when the revolution took place in our vowel sounds, we said *kena*, *kera*, not *sena*, *sera*. Now that we propose to reform our vowel sounds in *cena*, *cera*, why should we find *kena*, *kera* more offensive than *sena*, *sera*? Our English *k* is common before all vowels alike and such consonants as it can precede in Latin, and is at least as euphonious as *s* or *tch*: *kettle* and *kin* are not less mellifluous than *settle* and *sin*: *Kikero* I prefer to *Tchitchero*; and I doubt whether *Kikero* is to an Italian more offensive or strange than *Sisero*, as they too have abundant *k* (*ch*) sounds before *e* and *i*. Assuredly the many Greek words like *Cilicia*, *Cibyra*, *scena*, *cithara*, *Cithaeron* I would rather have with their Greek than their Latin sounds.

Quite the same is my experience with the very numerous cases of *-ci*, *-si*, *-ti* before another vowel: *vicies*, *visio*, *vitium*; *species*, *spatium*, *ratio*, *gratia*, *solacium*. Habit here too is all-powerful, whichever direction it takes. The common English pronunciation of Greek words like Λυσίας is I believe Λυshίας, Πελοποννηshιοι, Μιληshιοι and the like, though custom seems to permit a more correct sounding of the σ. The pronunciation of the oldest Greek scholars within my recollection, such as the late Bishop Butler and Mr George Burgess, proved that some generations ago Greek was in many points sounded more like Latin than it is now. Bishop Blomfield was fond of telling an anecdote about a Freshman examined by Porson. The Freshman talked of βέλshῐον: Porson intimated a preference for βέλ-τῖον. The Freshman politely allowed the Professor to please himself; but had all his life been accustomed to *belshion* and intended to stick to it. I think it not unlikely that before he took his degree he became reconciled to βέλτιον, and that if the will were present, it would take us less time to exchange *rayshio* for *ratio*, *speeshiees* for *spekies*.

Nay if we keep within the limits of the Oxford paper, we shall be forced to many awkward inconsistencies. Suppose we are comparing the successive forms of words which we see collected in the first volume of the

new Corpus Inscript., such as *coira, coera, cura*; *Cailius* and *Caelius*; *Coilius* and *Coelius*, *Caicilius* and *Caecilius*, we must pronounce *Koira, sera, kura*; *Kailius* and *Selius*; *Koilius* and *Selius*; *Kaisilius* and *Sesilius*. The more ancient *pulcer* and *Gracci* will be *pulser* and *Graksi*, the more recent *pulcher* and *Gracchi* will be *pulker* and *Grakki*: *coëpi* and *coepi* will be *koëpi* and *sepi*. And so with an indefinite number of terminations: *baca* and *bacae* will be *baka* and *basae*, *siccus* and *sicci* will be *sikkus* and *siksi*. Long-suffering as we are on such points with our present system, a partially improved method would perhaps render them intolerable. The Italian shuns such inconsistencies by substituting *ch* (= *k*) for *c*: *secco, secchi*, and *lungo, lunghe*.

It is doubtful whether our improved *y* sound of *j* will not by contrast make such inconsistencies appear even more flagrant. Habit makes us acquiesce in our English way of pronouncing such words as *ioci, iugi, coniugibus* and the like: but will not *yosi, yuji*; *conyujibus* be somewhat uncouth? The Italians practically reverse this process, and give our *j* sound to the consonantal *i* and our *k* and hard *g* sound to the *c* and *g*; by writing *giuochi, gioghi*. This *gi* in fact is the almost universal substitute for the Latin *j*, *aiutare* (*adiutare*) being quite exceptional.

But though to my present feeling to reform the pronunciation of *j* for instance and leave that of *c* unchanged, would almost be worse than to do nothing, the important point is to know what is right or probably right. However firmly one may have held the common belief that the sound of the Latin *c* was in all cases the same as κ or our *k*, the fact of such an authority as Mr Max Müller calling it in question, must make one hesitate. Still a variety of considerations compels me to retain my former belief.

He points out with much force that it does not follow, because Greeks and others in transferring Latin words into their own language always represented *c* by *k*, that therefore the sound of the two letters was always identical. And yet the fact that Greek and barbarian, Goth and German alike, do reproduce the Latin *c* by *k* is such a prima facie argument of identity or near resemblance, that strong counter evidence is needed to rebut it. Hahn's Grammar and Dictionary shew that the Albanian has sounds representing most of the modern corruptions of the Latin *c*, such as various σ and ζ sounds. The *cicer*, which must have been imported into those countries in early times, perhaps by Atticus on his farm at Buthrotum, is represented by κγκγερε: this *y* (or German *j*) sound being exceedingly common in Albanian after all vowels, α and ο as well as ε and ι. Now when I think of the Greek Κικέρων and then of his own eponymous *cicer* reproduced on one side by the Albanian κγκγερε and on the other by the German *kicher*, each of these languages shewing only the first and to them most natural deviation from the pure *k* sound, the concentrated force of the three impresses me strongly[1].

[1] It strikes me as improbable that Ulfilas, after years of intercourse with Roman dignitaries in Constantinople during its early days, and living with his flock in the midst of Latin-speaking nations, should have got his Latin words through any 'Greek transliteration'; and, as to the form *aivaggeli*, surely although in modern Greek γγ and in Italian *ng* are alike sounded as *ng*, the very fact that the Greeks put γ for ν and that some of the best Roman Grammarians wished to write in Latin *aggulus, aggens, iggerunt* and the like, prove that it was different in ancient times.

For the Greeks, though indeed they did represent *f* by *φ*, took much pains to reproduce the most peculiar Latin sounds. How trying must it have been to the eyes and ears of a Greek—unless he wished to laugh at the barbarians—to find in his Polybius Ποστούμιος Ῥήγουλος (Postŭmius Regŭlus), in his D. Cassius Οὐουλτούρνου (Vulturni), in his Dionysius Οὐολούσκιος (Volscius), in his Ptolemy Οὐιρουεδρούμ, and the like. If the Latin *-ce* and *-ci* had anything of an *s* sound, why could not the Greeks represent them by some combination of *ξ* or *ζ* or *σ*, such as were used in Byzantine times? The Greeks would probably have given to these sounds some conventional meaning, as to those odd accumulations of *ου*: nor do I think they would have cared for the quantity of such barbarous words; or, if they had cared for it, would have hesitated to change it. Indeed any consideration of quantity seems to me to apply with tenfold force to the supposition of an *s* added to the *k* sound in Latin, so long as quantity was regarded, or to the Italian *tch*, which surely must have been anterior to the English or French *s* sound.

Yet more weighty to my mind is the fact that the Romans in all cases expressed *κ* by *c*. In old times they could only reproduce Greek words in the rudest way; but for several generations this nation of philologers expended vast energy in overcoming this difficulty. For this purpose they introduced no less than five 'diacritical' letters or combinations of letters, *y*, *z*, *ch*, *ph*, *th*, in order to reproduce with the nicest accuracy every Greek sound; and schooled their tongue to utter words which once were most strange to them. At first content with *Téses*, they finally brought themselves to adopt *Theseús*, a sound and intonation most alien to a Roman ear. Long satisfied with *Saguntum*, with *sepurus* or *sepirus*, *lucinus* or *licinus*, they came at last to *Zacynthus*, *zephyrus*, *lychnus*, containing each of them three letters or combinations of letters utterly foreign to them. So that at length they came to revel in such sweet sounds as *Antheús*, and *Mnestheús*, and *Actiàs Oreíthyia*.

Why then, when they had got to *Cepheús*, *Cephalus*, *Chalcis*, *cithara* and the like, if *c* was not exactly equivalent to *k*, did they not adopt here too a 'diacritical' letter? One was at hand, more ready for use than any of the five adopted, their own *k*, now lying idle, with only an antiquarian value before *a* in a few words or symbols of words. And on this point the *dekembres* of no. 844 of the Corpus inscr. vol. 1 seems to have some bearing. This is one of nearly 200 short, plebeian, often half-barbarous very old inscriptions on a collection of ollae. The *k* before *e* or any letter except *a* is solecistic, just as in no. 831 is the *c.* instead of *k.* for *calendas*. From this I would infer that, as in the latter the writer saw no difference between *c* and *k*, so to the writer of the former *k* was the same as *c* before *e*. Perhaps *keri* tells the same tale, if, as Mommsen assumes, it be the genitive of *cerus* (*creator*).

The following too appears to me to have no small significance. In Cicero's time from an abuse of Greek fashions the aspirate was permanently attached to a few Latin words. Cicero tells us (Orator § 160) that till late in life he had persisted in saying *pulcros*, *Cetegos*, *triumpos*, *Cartaginem*; but after a hard atruggle evil habit and public opinion forced him to insert the *h* in these words. It appears now from inscriptions and Quintilian (I, 5, 20) that this *h*, which in some words was permanent, in others not,

was attached to *c* alike before *a*, *o*, *u* and *e*, *i*: in the 1st vol. of the Corpus inscr. we find *Volchacia* and *Achilio* (*Acilio*); often *Pulcher*, but also *Pulcer*. We have *Gracchus* and *Graccus*, *Gracchis* and *Graccis*: Quintilian refers to what he calls Catullus' 'nobile epigramma' *Chommoda dicebat*, and says that some inscriptions still extant have *choronae chenturiones praechones*. It is I believe generally allowed that the ancient sound of θ, ϕ, χ was that of the tenuis with a distinct *h* sound attached to it. But even conceding that *ch* was like the modern Greek or Scotch or German guttural, in either case I do not well see how the aspirate could have been attached to the *c*, if *c* had not a *k* sound, or how in this case *c* before *e* or *i* could have differed from *c* before *a*, *o*, *u*.

And finally, what is to me most convincing of all, I do not well understand how in a people of Grammarians, where for 700 years from Ennius to Priscian the most distinguished writers were also the most minute philologers, not one, so far as we know, should have hinted at any difference, if such existed: neither Ennius, Accius or Lucilius, the three greatest of the early poets; nor Cicero, Varro or Cæsar; nor Pliny or Quintilian, nor Gellius, Charisius, Donatus, Servius or Priscian. Lucilius devoted whole books to such slight matters as the use of *fervit* or *fervet*; *i* or *ei* in terminations. Cicero in his Orator and elsewhere dwells on what seem to us very trivial minutiæ. Varro asserted that *lact* was right, *lac* wrong; Cæsar in his 'de analogia', addressed to Cicero, maintained that Varro and *lact* were both wrong, *lac* alone right. He told Cicero that the genitive of their common friend Pompeiius' name ought to have three *i*'s and explained how they were to be pronounced; but seems to have said nothing of the *c*'s in *Cicero*. Quintilian tells us how to pronounce the *i* of *optimus*, the final *e* of *here*, and much else of an equally important nature. And all know that Gellius, Servius, Priscian and the rest are brimful from first to last of the most insignificant details: but of a soft *c* not one syllable.

Nay, what is even more to the point, Priscian relates at length how Pliny heard three different sounds of *l*: an 'exilis sonus' as in *ille*: a 'plenus' as in *sol*: a 'medius' as in *lectus*. So Priscian himself finds the *n* of *nomen* to be 'plenior', that of *annis* to be 'exilior'; and not only is there a difference in final *m*, but the *m* of *magnus* 'apertum sonat', the *m* of *umbra* 'mediocre'. Of *c* οὐδὲ γρῦ, singular indeed if its sound differed perceptibly before different letters; for surely the distinctions in the letters just enumerated cannot have been so very great.

Quite as little classical authority can I find for our strange confusion of sounds in many classes of words, important from their great number, as they happen to occur in so many common inflexions: I speak of *ce*, *ci*, *si*, *se*, *si*, *ti*, coming before another vowel, to all of which we give the same Hebraic βέλshiον sound: *iaceam*, *placeo*, *iacies*, *faciunt*, *condicio*; *nausea*, *caesius divisio*; *ratio*, *gratia*, *retia*, *otium*, *indutiae*, etc. etc. The modern confusion of sounds here comes I believe not from classical times, but from the 'colluvies gentium' which met together on the breaking up of the old world. Mr Müller says Corssen has 'proved (p. 54) that from about 200 A.D. words with *ti* began to be spelt with *ci*. How was that possible? if *ci* was always pronounced *ki*, then assibilated *ti* could never have been written *ci*.' The 'never' is surely too much: Ribbeck in his prolegomena to Virgil, p. 241, gives dozens of instances where one or other of his capital

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 003 370 844 0

Mss. write *c* for *t* or *t* for *c*; such as *ac* for *at*, *tetera* for *cetera*, *tumulos* for *cumulos*, *etquis* for *ecquis*, in none of which can the two letters have had the least similarity of sound. But he gives not a single instance of confusion in a capital Ms. between the *ci* and *ti* in question: these Mss. write without fail *dicio*, *solacia*, *facies*, *proditio*, *seditio*, *ratio*, *spatium*. And yet almost every line of Latin offers opportunities for blundering on this point. When we consider this, the half-dozen instances in Corssen seem quite inadequate to prove confusion between *ci* and *ti*. For there are but six which have even a prima facie look of sufficiency: the most promising of these is *renunciationem* from a Roman inscription of A.D. 211. But when we look into its pedigree, we find that Orelli copies it from Reinesius' collection 'quibus nihil imperfectius vitiosiusque extet,' says Iac. Gronovius: 'ipse lapides nullos viderat' says another scholar: 'who exceeds all bounds in saxa violentius grassando,' says a third. When we remember then that in Reinesius' time *renunciatio* was the recognised spelling, that one instance after another of *conditio* for example vanishes when it can be put to the test, surely the chances are a hundred to one that the *c* is due to Reinesius or some previous transcriber, not to the old Roman chiseller. Two more of unknown age are due to old copies taken when *ocio* at least was a received spelling: two more are published by Renier from a copy taken by a French officer at Medjana in Africa, Africa great mother of barbarisms and heresies. The 6th has an unquestionable voucher: Mommsen's inscr. reg. Neap. 109 has *disposicionem*. It was copied at Salerno; but it must be late and is very barbarous, containing also *rivocaverit*, *distituta*, *populusquae*, an unmeaning *suetad*, the language being in part unintelligible. Had Corssen applied his vast industry to post-classical times, he might have collected without effort 100,000 clear instances of the confusion in question, the only reason with many apparently for writing *racio*, *spacium*, *faties*, *speties* being that the spelling was wrong. We still see some relics of this barbarism of the middle ages in *conditio*, *solatium*, *nuncius*, and the like.

We have however late classical authority of the 5th century for a corruption of *ti* (not *ci*): Servius tells us that *medius* was pronounced *medsius*, something like the Italian *mezzo*: Pompeius, probably of the same age, informs us that it is a fault to say *Titius*, not *Titsius*. If therefore we prefer the 5th century, to the age of Cicero and Quintilian, we should say, not *Tishius*, *Horashius*, but *Titzius*, *Horatzius*: but then to be consistent we should also say *medzius*, *commodzius*. From the strange emphasis with which Pompeius asserts that *Titsius* is right, *Titius* wrong, I should infer that this was a new fashion; and that *laiktio* represented to Ulfilas the sound of *lectio* in his day, while *kautsjo* gave the sound of *cautio* in the year 551. In Servius' time the natural feeling for quantity was utterly gone: it had to be learnt as artificially as it is learnt now. But in earlier classical times such pronunciations were out of the question. Indeed if we are to observe quantity, which many of us think a vital part of reform, I hardly know how with any of the modern fashions of pronouncing we are properly to enunciate *rătio* and *Horātius*, *făcies* and *solācium*.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY C. J. CLAY, M.A. AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.